



FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

GENERAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

Tuesday, September 09, 2014

11:30 AM – 1:30 PM

Meeting hosted by: Darcie White, Clarion Associates
Elyse Dinnocenzo, Clarion Associates

General Plan Review Committee Members Present:

- Jim Liesen
- Dean Barlow
- Gerald Henkels
- Don Bergen
- Laura Smith
- Nello Ruscitti
- Dan Keyes
- Dorothy McMaster
- Mark Talley
- Mike Eigenbrodt

General Plan Review Committee Members Absent:

- Doug Traub
- Donna Brister
- Dick Gilbert
- Donna Best-Carlton

Darcie White of Clarion Associates welcomed the General Plan Review Committee members and introduced herself and Elyse Dinnocenzo. She provided a brief description of how the two projects (General Plan update and Development Code rewrite) are happening simultaneously. She clarified that

Don Elliott and Kristin Cisowski will be working on the code update. Working on the projects simultaneously helps keep both projects in sync regarding policies, regulations, vision, etc. The purpose of today's meeting is to focus on the General Plan update.

At the conclusion of her opening remarks, Darcie presented a PowerPoint slideshow to the committee touching on the following topics:

General Plan Purpose

- Long range vision for the community
- Guides where and how the city will grow
- Establishes city policies (advisory not regulatory)
- Establishes priorities to guide the allocation of resources

Why Update the General Plan?

- Last ratified in 2002
- City has since exceeded population threshold (50,000) requiring new plan elements under Arizona State law
- Targeted updates are needed throughout

Public Involvement Plan

- Communication Strategy
 - Project Website
 - E-Newsletters
 - Flyers/Direct Notification
 - Media Updates
 - Social Media
- Activities and Events
 - Public Information Sessions
 - Community Workshops
 - Online Engagement
 - General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) Meetings

General Plan Update: Work Plan

- Complete: Initial Scoping & Direction
- Underway: General Plan Assessment
- October 2014: Draft General Plan
- December 2014: Final General Plan (Adoption Draft)
- 2015 (TBD): Ratification of General Plan

Following the slideshow presentation, Darci spoke to the Committee regarding their roles and responsibilities. She asked for input regarding how the Committee would like to communicate with City Council. Mr. Barlow indicated a brief written update would be preferable.

The second portion of the meeting focused on a review of the sections in the Community Trends & Data draft. At the start of each section, Elyse provided comments/concerns that were received via on-line surveys or community workshops. Following Elyse's inputs, committee members each had the opportunity to express their comments/concerns.

Jim Liesen asked questions regarding the projections of growth and how those numbers are arrived at. He was curious if the figures were a continuation of what we currently have or a study on economic factors. Darci replied historic trends and state level estimates are the basis. Analysis shows growth just under 1%. The population is approximately 52,000 now, expecting to be around 67,000 in the next 20 years.

Individual sections were addressed, one at a time.

Vision Statement Discussion

Elyse reported the following summarized comments/concerns were received:

- Opportunities to include cultural diversity
- How to manage growth
- Encourage ASU expansion

Committee summarized comments/concerns (not limited to):

- Level out growth, consistent with economic forecasts
- Regarding wages, would prefer to use the word “livable” not “excellent”
- Remove references to “big city”
- Remove references to “world class”
- Add reference to “quality of life”
- Add reference to “action oriented recreation” of all sports types

Land Use & Growth Management

Elyse reported the following summarized comments/concerns were received:

- Equal allocation of funds across the city for infrastructure
- Revitalization of vacant industrial and commercial areas in north end of city
- Add reference to the 3 year agreement with BLM for use of public land
- Concerns for/against recreation areas close to housing
- Compatibility concerns with expanding population
- Cell tower screening & other utility screening
- Increased density in terms of housing or commercial development
- Improve gateway to the city
- Area specific policies (island area where you have different needs)

Committee summarized comments/concerns (not limited to):

- Continue to work with state or BLM regarding land use decisions
- Body Beach property should be acquired by the city
- Retain community character and design
- Entrances and corridors needs to be cohesive, professional, finished
- Residential expansion concerns regarding population increasing
- Signage for gateways
- Highway corridor is unfinished, un-kept, overgrown sidewalks, trash, etc.
- Continue and increase focus on preserving the shoreline
- Protection of view corridors
- Structural application of the General Plan - it is too easy to approve minor amendments
- Protection of the lake

- Growth impact on the community
- Define the driver of economic growth and provide sufficient resources to that driver
- Improve relationship with ADOT to enhance beautification of Hwy 95
- Additional trail expansion north and south
- Continue shared uses on the lake (19 jurisdictions)
- Land use growth management-do not encourage large scale residential development; do not want all houses to look alike

Housing

Elyse reported the following summarized comments/concerns were received:

- Homelessness
- Work force housing
- Complete neighborhoods (self-sustainable, limited commercial, gas, grocery, school, etc.)

Committee summarized comments/concerns (not limited to):

- Complete neighborhood approach should not be encouraged
- Great need to address homelessness in our self-contained community
- Great need for additional mental health facilities
- Lack of good transportation to outside areas
- Housing element at odds-segregated sections vs. close proximity to amenities
- Shared use property issues related to homelessness
- Transitional housing - important to provide a place for these people
- Provide incentives to developers to utilize and develop vacant residential properties
- How to manage student housing, vacation rentals, sober homes, shelters, etc.
- What formula is/shall be used for determining mixed use vs. water availability
- Continue to enhance concepts of open space access
- New development should be required to coordinate with the Trails Master Plan regarding connect-ability
- More buffers needed between residential and commercial areas
- Group homes should not be allowed in residential areas
- Additional shared use areas with bicycles
- Community has great need for shelters (men/women) and orphanages

(Darcie White stated some of these comments/concerns will be addressed in the Development Code rewrite.)

Economy

Elyse reported the following summarized comments/concerns were received:

- Island development
- Marina launch expansion
- ASU campus expansion
- Extended work force training
- Pedestrian friendly downtown area

Committee summarized comments/concerns (not limited to):

- Tendency to react to economic changes instead of following General Plan intent

- Parking in common issues
- Additional launch facilities for the boating sector
- Beach enhancement and beautification
- Expanded ASU housing
- Flexibility to balance economic needs when the opportunity arises
- Continue to improve parking on McCulloch Boulevard for large events
- Create innovative ways to help commercial development
- Seek out partnerships with more groups like Mainstreet organization
- Bring in livable wage jobs to encourage ASU graduates to stay in our area
- Create less restrictive processes to request/obtain change regarding tourism, service, and job activities
- Proactive engagement and education of bigger businesses to encourage them to come to Lake Havasu City, rather than using the same population formula of other larger cities
- Need is great for a convention center
- Need is great for air service

Circulation

Elyse reported the following summarized comments/concerns were received:

- Separated areas and paths for bicycles
- Increased need for sidewalks and pedestrian transportation
- Improve signal timing on Hwy 95
- Roadway lighting
- Conceptual roadway extensions should be added to map
- Update to transportation component should be delayed until completion of MPO study
- Complete street in downtown area
- Revisit the 1998 study for the MPO incorporation

Committee summarized comments/concerns (not limited to):

- Important need for city transit public transportation - voucher system temporary solution
- Investigate funding options for public transportation
- Additional separated trails, paths, areas for pedestrians, bicycles, skate board, long boards, etc.
- Livable wage jobs
- Focus on areas where you enter and exit the city

At the conclusion of the last item, Darcie began the rewrap-up discussion.

Darcie and Laura had discussion regarding planning documents and ordinances. Laura inquired about references made to certain planning documents, but other studies of key interest were not referenced. Additionally, she expressed concern to the number of references made to the Commercial Health District ordinance. Darcie responded studies were referenced in some places and not others. If they missed some it was not intentional. As for the Health District ordinance, there was a link to that in the General Plan policies, but it does not have any greater importance than any other document.

Dorothy McMaster stated that discussion did not cover the island much. She believes a second bridge to the island needs to be addressed. Darci responded that there is a policy in the plan that talks about a

second bridge and this is both a safety and transportation issue. The MPO project will be looking at this as well.

Laura Smith asked Darci where the General Plan falls in regard to the Growing Smarter legislation. Darci responded that the intent is that the Plan is your guiding document. It is by nature going to be a higher level document. I think the overall intent to the Growing Smarter legislation, is that your Development Code is consistent with your plan. Your point about there being inconsistencies is always a challenge. I think the goal is that your plan needs to have some flexibility but you shouldn't be flat out inconsistent in terms of what your regulations are saying. That is something we will work through. Your points about the amendment process is something we will talk more with staff about and get some more information to revisit that topic.

Final comments from Darci included:

- Clarion Development Code Review Committee meeting scheduled for September 30, 2014
- General Plan preliminary draft document due to this Committee on October 30, 2014
- Request for any additional comments to be forwarded to Stuart Schmeling

Meeting concluded at 1:30 PM.